

## REMARKS

This is in response to the Advisory Action mailed January 26, 2004. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

### Amendments to Claims 1, 7 and 13

Applicants respectfully submit the above amendment, for the Examiner's consideration, of claims 1, 7 and 13. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended to provide further limitations of the scramble module, such as modules 22 and 16 of FIG. 1, passing the decoded content signal without conducting any scrambling of the signal provided to the decoders, such as decoders 24 and 18 of FIG. 1.

### Response to Examiner's assertions in the Advisory Action

As noted above, Applicants traverse the Examiner's statements made in the response to arguments after final office action on page 2 of the Advisory Action. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the claimed present invention as the claimed present invention is not "simply a 3-step method." Rather, the claimed present invention provides for improved control of the output of a content signal by generating and outputting a scrambled output signal based on content control settings.

For the sake of brevity, Applicants respectfully resubmit the previously offered position regarding the teachings of the prior art references.

On page 2, the Examiner asserts that Ming teaches that "a portion of program is scrambled or a blank screen is shown, not the entire program is precluded (Ming, col. 8/lines 51-64)." Applicants respectfully disagree as this Examiner-cited passage discloses generating new content for a precluded time period, e.g. t+10:11 until t+11:18. During this time interval, a blank screen is displayed with text of what is occurring. Ming teaches, *inter alia*, generating new content consisting of a blank screen and the generated text.

Allowable subject matter

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art references teach or suggest the claimed present invention of claims 1, 7 and 13. Including previously submitted limitations, the prior art fails to teach or suggest passing the content signal through a scrambler and then using the scrambler to scramble the signal if a content control indicator compares unfavorably to a content control setting. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 7 and 13 contain patentable subject matter in view of the prior art of record. As such, passage of these claims to issuance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-22 contain further patentable subject matter and are allowable not merely as dependent upon an allowable base claim. Therefore, passage of these claims to issuance is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Date: February 23, 2004

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (312) 609-7500  
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy J. Bechen  
Reg. No. 48,126